

April 16, 1998

**List of Organizations/Individuals Requesting Extension of
Programmatic EIS/EIR Comment Period**

<u>Commentor</u>	<u>Date Rec'd</u>	<u>Extension Requested</u>	<u>Reason for Request*</u>
Cal. Assemblyman Tom Woods (2 nd District)	3/26/98	None defined	1
Steve Worthley (Cottonwood, CA)	4/2/98	None defined	2
Patricia Clarke (Chair, Shasta Co. Water Agency)	4/10/98	None defined	3
Marcia Basque (Regional Council of Rural Cos.)	4/13/98	120 days	4
Congressman Wally Herger (2 nd District)	4/13/98	None defined	5
Environmental Water Caucus	4/13/98	75 days	6
Harrison Phipps (Water Resources Association of Yolo County)	4/15/98	60 days	7

*1) "We are about to make one of the most important policy decisions of this decade. We should not act hastily. Simply put, seventy-five days is not enough time to make this monumental decision."

2) "I am writing to protest the extremely short time allowed for public review of CALFED's Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR. 75 days is not sufficient time to read and study such a lengthy document, even if I had one in hand. Combine the amount of reading necessary with having to travel to the documents and you can see that it's an impossible task."

3) "Shasta County finds that this document is, in effect, a new California Water Plan. It touches on virtually every water issue in California and, in many cases, proposes solutions. The existing 75-day public review period for the subject document, concluding on June 1, 1998, is insufficient for the review of such a massive document."

4) "CALFED's final decision could literally change the physical and socio-economic landscape of the state for generations to come. Due to potential significant economic, environmental and community impacts on rural California, RCRC requests that the time period for public comment on CALFED's DEIR/EIS, be extended . . . We believe that without adequate time for review and comment, the CALFED Program may be put into jeopardy. The imposition of a 75-day public comment period on this document is not adequate to achieve greater public awareness, involvement and support."

5) "Because of the size of this document and its potential for negative impact on California communities I respectfully request an extension of time for comment on the draft EIS and its accompanying three alternatives."

6) "Given the breadth and complexity of the issues addressed in the CALFED process, the other demands of the CALFED process, as well as the length of the document, we believe that the current comment period is unrealistic. Further, the ongoing discussions regarding inclusion of surface storage in the proposed water bond act are diverting key staff resources from the review of the CALFED draft environmental document."

7) "Given the large size of the DEIR, additional time is required to adequately review and prepare comments. . . A 60-day extension to the comment period does not seem unreasonable considering implementation of the proposed program is expected to take 30-years. . . Additional time for review and comment is justified given the multi-billion dollar costs associated with implementation of the proposed program."